

- 5 -

Remarks

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on June 05, 2006. Claims 29-36 are standing for examination. The Examiner states that claims 30, 32, 34, and 36 are unclear under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sassin et al. (US 6,058,435) hereinafter Sassin. Claims 30, 32, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sassin.

In response to the Examiner's rejections and statements, applicant provides amendments to the claims to overcome the 112 rejection. Applicant provides arguments which clearly show that Sassin fails to teach or suggest all of applicant's claim limitations.

The Examiner states that Sassin teaches; " in response to a task being prepared for service, determining the skill set that would be best suited for responding to the task, building a resume table of available agents, wherein the resume table is organized by skill sets that include all skills possessed by the agent...".

Applicant argues, as clearly recited in applicant's claim language, that the skills required for servicing the call are determined from the incoming communication then building a resume table of available agents and organizing the skill table. In this manner the skills required are known before the table is generated to facilitate finding the best agent without doing a complete database search of every agent as in the art of Sassin.

Further applicant argues that the independent claims specifically recite creating a table of all of the agents that are a best match for servicing the task. Sassin specifically teaches selecting individual agents from the database based on a skill resume for each agent and the agent is selected having at least a specific number associated with servicing the task (col. 9, line 51 to col. 10, line 1). Sassin fails to teach a collective skill table of all available agents as claimed.

Applicant argues that Sassin fails to teach all of limitations recited in applicant's independent claims; therefore the 102 rejection fails as a prima facie case of anticipation

- 6 -

has not been shown. Applicant believes claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 are clearly patentable over the art of Sassin. Claims 30, 32, 34 and 36 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended upon a patentable claim.

As all of the claims have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that the case be passed quickly to issue. If any fees are due beyond fees paid with this amendment, authorization is made to deduct those fees from deposit account 50-0534. If any time extension is needed beyond any extension requested with this amendment, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joseph B. Agusta

by /Donald R. Boys/
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
831-768-1755